

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/722,345		KURIMOTO, NAOYA	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Hien D. Vu		2833	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. Hien D. Vu. (3)_____.

(2) Mr. Brian Hanlon. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 03 June 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 2-19.

Identification of prior art discussed: Krehbiel et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: discussed and agreed upon changes to clarify the claimed invention of claims 15 and 19 to more clearly set forth the intended concept and to more distinctly define over the prior art of record, to cancel claims 2-4 and 17-18 thereby to place the case in condition for allowance.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required.